

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6318**

---

ROYAL POLLARD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MR. REYNOLDS, Major/Supervisor; MR. SAPP, R.R.J. Officer; MR.  
LARON DELOATCH, R.R.J. Officer; MS. SPRATLEY, R.R.J.  
(Grievance Coordinator); MR. LANGLEY, R.R.J. (Captain); MR.  
POWELL, R.R.J. (OPR Sergeant/Coordinator); MR. BROWN (#142),  
R.R.J. (security officer); MR. JEFFERY NEWTON, R.R.J.  
(superintendent); OFFICER MARTINEZ,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District  
Judge. (2:16-cv-00034-RAJ-RJK)

---

Submitted: June 23, 2016

Decided: June 29, 2016

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Royal Pollard, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Royal Pollard seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-47 (1949). Because the deficiencies identified by the district court may be remedied by the filing of an amended complaint, we conclude that the order Pollard seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc., 807 F.3d 619, 623 (4th Cir. 2015); Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993).

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED